

Comment Number	Did Response Address Comment?	Confirmed Change in FSP
<i>Primary Comments</i>		
1	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	Yes
2	Adequate response is conditional to submittal of the survey monument map.	Updated map and Information included in the response but an updated/final map is pending after confirming the conditions of monuments per Aecom/Geosyntec email sent on 2/16/2018.
3	Response to this comment will be after the desired approval of the FSP. Accordingly the FSP will be conditionally approved since a task hazard analysis (THA) for Bathymetry work will not be developed prior to the desired approval date and 1 week before field work begins	Pending THA submittal and review.
4	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	Yes, based on review of the new Appendix A - Hydrographic Survey Work Plan and Quality Control Plan (David Evans Associates 2018) metadata generated during the survey will meet the National Geospatial Data Policy.
5	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	Yes, based on a cursory review of Appendix A.
<i>To be Considered Comments</i>		
1	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	Yes
2	Response is adequate pending review of a second work plan as needed to address comment details for the LIDAR contingency. A condition of approval will be established for delivery of this second work plan as necessary.	Yes, the response was incorporated into the FSP and performing the LIDAR survey is conditional pending review of the second work plan if needed.
3	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	Yes, based on a cursory review of Appendix A.
4	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	Yes
5	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	Yes.
6	The response addresses only the first portion of the comment. The second portion of the response does not address the comment and refers to a general agreement made during the February 7, 2018 meeting that "analysis of data will not be included in the FSP". This is missing the point of the comment. To clarify, the Pre-RD Work Plan describes that the bathymetric data will be used to assess changes in elevation/sedimentation over the past 15 years. As a result, the need to have compatibility between the planned bathymetry and past bathymetry is important to achieve this work plan objective and a QA/QC process should be described or outlined in a planning document, if not in this FSP then the QAPP, to ensure the new bathymetric data is collected in a manner that will meet objectives outlined in the work plan.	Yes, based on a review of the revised Appendix A, measurements will be made on the original 2004 and older survey monuments to verify reverted values reference desired results.
7	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	Yes
8	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	Yes, based on a cursory review of Appendix A.
9	The response is not recognizing what the comment is saying and once again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement about data analysis to deflect an appropriate response. The comment is requesting the FSP include the bulleted list as deliverables from the sampling effort in the FSP which will help with data quality assurance, it is not asking to perform analysis, or evaluate data	Deliverable list requested in comment was included with the exception of the figures showing backscatter results; Still not clear what the reference to the meeting agreement about data analysis is addressing, but FSP RLSO appears sufficient.
<i>Matters of Style Comments</i>		
1	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP	Yes
2	This response again refers to a 2-7-18 meeting agreement that "no analysis (evaluation) will be included in the FSPs" and misses the point of the comment. The comment is pointing to the stated deliverables, one of which is identified as field investigation summary type report. The comment is suggesting to include a summary of any deviations from the FSP, which is a standard section to include in a field investigation report, rather than hunting for deviations within all of the field notes.	Yes, based on discussion at the 2/20/2018 meeting the comment to add a deviation from the FSP section to the proposed report content was acknowledged by the group.

Legend

	Response is adequate pending review of updated FSP
	Indicates a Conditional Approval need and callout for extra attention to the RLSO in the FSP and/or QAPP
	Not responsive and needs correction